

Application No. : 10/789,815
Amdt. Dated : December 12, 2006
Reply To O.A. Of : September 12, 2006

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

DEC 12 2006

Summary Of Interview

On December 7, 2006, Examiner Tony Ko and Applicant's representative John M. Grover conducted a telephone interview. U.S. Patent No. 6,388,707 to Suda was discussed. Agreement was reached that the incorporation of the features of dependent Claims 5 and 6 into independent Claim 1 and the incorporation of the features of dependent Claims 15 and 16 into independent Claim 14 would overcome the rejections of Claims 1 and 14.

Application No. : 10/789,815
Amdt. Dated : December 12, 2006
Reply To O.A. Of : September 12, 2006

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

DEC 12 2006

REMARKS

The Applicant thanks the Examiner for his careful and thoughtful examination of the present application. By way of summary, Claims 1, 4-25, and 27-38 were pending in this application. In the present amendment, the Applicant has canceled Claims 5, 6, 15, 16, 25, and 27-38 without prejudice or disclaimer and has amended Claims 1, 7, 8, 14, 17, and 24. Accordingly, Claims 1, 4, 7-14, and 17-24 remain pending for consideration.

The Applicant would like to thank Examiner Tony Ko for the interview extended to the Applicant's counsel of record, John M. Grover, on December 7, 2006. During the interview, an agreement was reached relating to the language of Claims 1 and 14. Accordingly, the Applicants have amended Claims 1 and 14 along the lines discussed in the interview. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the pending amended claims.

Amendments To The Drawings

In the July 19, 2006 Amendment submitted in response to the Office Action dated April 19, 2006, the Applicant submitted Substitute Formal Drawings of Figures 1-5. The Examiner has not yet indicated whether these drawings were entered, and the Applicant requests clarification as to the status of the drawings.

Information Disclosure Statement

The Applicant filed an Information Disclosure Statement and accompanying PTO/SB/08 equivalent citing 6 references on June 9, 2006. The Applicant notes that the PTO/SB/08 equivalent was not returned, nor was inclusion of the same marked on the Cover Sheet of the Final Office Action dated September 12, 2006. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests that the June 9, 2006 IDS be properly considered, and a copy of the submitted PTO/SB/08 equivalent, including an indication of the consideration, be returned in a next communication from the Patent Office.

Application No. : 10/789,815
Amdt. Dated : December 12, 2006
Reply To O.A. Of : September 12, 2006

Rejection Of Claims 1, 4-9, 14-16, 18-21, 24, 25, 27-31, and 33-36 Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Final Office Action rejected Claims 1, 4-9, 14-16, 18-21, 24, 25, 27-31, and 33-36 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,388,707, issued to Suda (the '707 patent). The Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection because the '707 patent fails to identically teach every element of the claim. See M.P.E.P. § 2131 (stating that in order to anticipate a claim, a prior art reference must identically teach every element of the claim).

Claims 1 and 14

The Final Office Action maintains that the '707 patent discloses a flexible eye cup including a pliable member capable of substantially for fitting an eye socket of a user. The Applicant respectfully disagrees and submits that the claims are patentable for at least the reasons noted in the response submitted July 19, 2006 to the Office Action dated April 19, 2006. Nevertheless, to advance prosecution, and pursuant to the agreement reached with the Examiner, Applicant has amended Claims 1 and 14.

The '707 patent does not teach or suggest at least "an infrared light source capable of illuminating the subject to be viewed by the user through the night vision device," as recited by amended Claim 1, or at least "receiving image data of objects illuminated by an infrared light source associated with a night vision device," as recited by amended Claim 14. Rather, the '707 patent discloses illuminating the eyeball of an operator of a camera with an infrared light and detecting the reflection from the cornea to detect the position of a line of sight. See the '707 patent at col. 6, ll. 36-40; col. 9, ll. 40-42; and col. 58, l. 65 – col. 59, l. 1. Therefore, the Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejections of Claims 1 and 14.

Claims 4 and 7-9

As described above, Applicant submits that amended Claim 1 is not anticipated by the '707 patent. Claims 4 and 7-9 each depend from Claim 1. Thus, Claims 4 and 7-9 include all the features of amended Claim 1 and recite unique combinations of additional features not taught or suggested by the cited references. Therefore, the

Application No. : 10/789,815
Amdt. Dated : December 12, 2006
Reply To O.A. Of : September 12, 2006

Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejections of Claims 4 and 7-9.

Claims 18-21 and 24

As described above, Applicant submits that amended Claim 14 is not anticipated by the '707 patent. Claims 18-21 and 24 each depend from Claim 14. Thus, Claims 18-21 and 24 include all the features of amended Claim 14 and recite unique combinations of additional features not taught or suggested by the cited references. Therefore, the Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejections of Claims 18-21 and 24.

Claims 5, 6, 15, 16, 25, 27-31, and 33-36

The rejections of Claims 5, 6, 15, 16, 25, 27-31, and 33-36 are moot in light of the cancellation of those claims.

Rejection Of Claims 10-13, 22, 23, 32, 34, 37, and 38 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Final Office Action rejected Claims 10-13, 22, 23, 32, 34, 37, and 38 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over the '707 patent. The Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection because the '707 patent, either alone or in combination with other references of record, fails to teach or suggest all of the elements of the claims. See M.P.E.P. § 2143 (stating that in order to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness for a claim, the prior art references must teach or suggest all the claim limitations).

Claims 10-13

As described above, Applicants submit that amended Claim 1 is patentable over the '707 patent. Claims 10-13, which depend from Claim 1, are believed to be patentable for at least the same reasons articulated above with respect to amended Claim 1, and because of the additional features recited therein. Therefore, the Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejections of Claims 10-13.

Application No. : 10/789,815
Amdt. Dated : December 12, 2006
Reply To O.A. Of : September 12, 2006

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

DEC 12 2006

Claims 22 and 23

As described above, Applicants submit that amended Claim 14 is patentable over the '707 patent. Claims 22 and 23, which depend from Claim 14, are believed to be patentable for at least the same reasons articulated above with respect to amended Claim 14, and because of the additional features recited therein. Therefore, the Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejections of Claims 22 and 23.

Claims 32, 34, 37, and 38

The rejections of Claims 32, 34, 37, and 38 are moot in light of the cancellation of those claims.


Summary

Applicant respectfully submits that all of the pending claims are allowable. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejections and to pass Claims 1, 4, 7-14, and 7-24 to allowance. In addition, please charge any additional fees, including any fees for additional extension of time, or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 11-1410.

Respectfully submitted,

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

Dated: December 12, 2006

By: 
Andrew I. Kimmel
Registration No. 58,855
Attorney of Record
(949) 760-0404

3107580
111308